

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,846	08/22/2003	Se Jun Heo	1670.1013	8145
49455	7590 04/19/2006		EXAMINER	
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP			SANTIAGO, MARICELI	
1400 EYE S SUITE 300	TREET, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2879	
			DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summany		10/645,846	HEO ET AL.	an
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Mariceli Santiago	2879	
۔۔ Period for l	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ss
A SHOF WHICH - Extensic after SIX - If NO pe - Failure t Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. riod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we or eply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time  Till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠ TI 3)⊡ Si	esponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 Fe</u> nis action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This ince this application is in condition for alloward osed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		erits is
Disposition	of Claims			
4a 5)	laim(s) 1,4-17 and 19-25 is/are pending in the laim(s) is/are withdraw laim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) 1,4-17 and 19-25 is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or a Papers  e specification is objected to by the Examiner e drawing(s) filed on 23 August 2003 is/are: oplicant may not request that any objection to the deplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction e oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner e oath or declaration	vn from consideration.  relection requirement.  r. a) ⊠ accepted or b) □ objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected to the drawing(	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1	
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)⊠ 1. 2. 3.	knowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureaus the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	ge
2)	f References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) o(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te	2)

Art Unit: 2879

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on February 28, 2006, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Cancellation of claims 2, 3 and 18 has been entered.

Claims 1, 4-17 and 19-25 are pending in the instant application.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codama et al. (US 6,307,3 17).

Regarding claims 1, 17 and 22, Codama discloses an EL device and a method of making the same, comprising a substrate (1), a first electrode unit comprising first electrodes (5) formed on the substrate, first electrode terminals (not shown but required to drive the display, Column 1, lines 39-43) connected to the respective first electrodes, a second electrode unit comprising second electrodes (4) formed over the first electrodes (see Figs. 2 and 3), and second electrode terminals (2, 3) connected to the respective second electrodes, an emission area formed where the first electrodes intersect the second electrode, an EL layer (7) disposed between the first electrodes and the second electrodes in the emission area, an inter insulating layer (6, layer contacting left side of electrode 5 in Fig. 3) provided under the EL layer and covering a space between each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes and an edge

portion of a top surface of each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes, and an outer insulating layer (6, layer contacting right side of electrode 5 in Fig. 3) between the emission area and the second electrode terminals, wherein the outer insulating layer comprises an insulating material formed to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area to reduced a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminals and the substrate (Fig. 3).

Codama fails to explicitly exemplify the limitation of the first electrodes formed as a plurality of parallel evenly spaced lines and the second electrodes extending in an orthogonal direction with respect to the first electrodes. However, in the same field of endeavor, Miyaguchi discloses an EL device further comprising a first electrode unit comprising first electrodes (R1) formed as a plurality of parallel evenly spaced lines on the substrate, and a second electrode unit comprising second electrodes (L1) formed in an orthogonal direction with respect to the first electrodes over the first electrodes (Column 2, lines 49-62). At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design engineering to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the first electrodes as a plurality of parallel evenly spaced lines and second electrodes formed in an orthogonal direction with respect to the first electrodes as disclosed by Miyaguchi since applicant's claimed first and second electrodes configuration does not solve any of the stated problems or yield any unexpected result that is not within the scope of the teaching applied. Furthermore, one skilled in the art would reasonable expect applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the electrode configuration disclosed by Codama or the electrode configuration disclosed by Miyaguchi since both arrangements perform the same function of providing the light emitting regions or pixel unit at the intersection the first and second electrodes. Accordingly, it would have been an obvious matter of design engineering to

Art Unit: 2879

modify the device of Codama in view of Miyaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim

1.

Regarding claim 4, Codama discloses the substrate comprising glass or plastic (Column 8, lines 29-35).

Regarding claims 7, 8, 19, 20 and 23, Codama discloses the outer insulating layer covering at least an edge (right edge) of the first electrode closest to the second electrode terminal covered by the outer insulating layer and the edge of each of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area (Fig. 3).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Codama discloses the second electrode passing over the outer insulating layer to contact the second electrode terminals (Fig. 3).

Claims 1, 4-8, 10-14, 17, 19-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaguchi et al. (US 6,297,589) in view of Tadokoro et al. (EP 1 022 931).

Regarding claims 1, 17 and 22, Miyaguchi discloses an EL device and a method of making the same, comprising a substrate (1), a first electrode unit comprising first electrodes (R1, G1, B1) formed on the substrate as a plurality of parallel evenly spaced lines (Fig. 1), and first electrode terminals (T, Fig. 4) connected to the respective first electrodes, a second electrode unit comprising second electrodes (L1, L2) formed in an orthogonal direction with respect to the first electrodes over the first electrodes (Figs. 1 and 2A), an emission area formed where the first electrodes intersect the second electrodes, an EL layer (4) disposed between the first electrodes and the second electrodes in the emission area, an inter insulating layer (2, Fig. 2A) provided under the EL layer and covering a space between each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes and an edge portion of a top surface of each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes, and an outer insulating layer (2, portion of layer in the periphery, outside

Art Unit: 2879

emission area). Miyaguchi is silent regarding the limitation of the second electrode unit comprising second electrode terminals, wherein the outer insulating layer is formed to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminal facing the emission area.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Tadokoro discloses an EL device having a second electrode unit comprising second electrodes and second electrode terminals, wherein an outer insulating layer is formed to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminal facing the emission area with the purpose of improving the contrast and the esthetics of the device by avoiding portions of the display to exhibit different colors due to the different components (Column 4, lines 10-23, and Column 9, lines 18-32). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide second electrode terminals with an outer insulating layer being formed to contact at least an edge thereof in order to improve the contrast of the device. Accordingly, the exhibition of different colors caused by the different components of the display (electrodes, terminals, uncovered parts of the substrate) is reduced, which is favorable from an esthetical point of view.

Regarding claim 4, Miyaguchi discloses the substrate comprising glass (Column 3, lines 46-47).

Regarding claim 5, Miyaguchi-Tadokoro discloses the second electrode terminals comprising a first terminal portion made of ITO and a second terminal portion comprising Cr (see EP '931, paragraph [0031]).

Regarding claim 6, Miyaguchi discloses the first electrode terminals being integrally formed with the first electrodes (Figs. 3-4).

Regarding claims 7-8, Miyaguchi-Tadokoro discloses the outer insulating layer covering at least an edge of the first electrode closest to the second electrode terminal covered by the

Art Unit: 2879

outer insulating layer and the edge of each of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area (Figs. 1 and 2A of '589, in view of Fig. 6 of EP '931).

Regarding claims 10-11, Miyaguchi-Tadokoro discloses the second electrode passing over the outer insulating layer to contact the second electrode terminals (Figs. 1 and 2A of '589, in view of Fig. 6 of EP '931).

Regarding claims 12-14, 21 and 25, Miyaguchi-Tadokoro discloses the claimed invention except for the limitation of forming a first buffer layer insulated from the first electrodes and the second electrode terminals. Miyaguchi-Tadokoro discloses a dielectric layer reducing a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminals and the substrate (Figs, 1 and 2A of '589, in view of Fig. 6 of EP '931).

However, Tadokoro discloses a method of forming an EL layer wherein the substrate is coated with a conductive layer comprising ITO, said layer being patterned into first electrodes, first electrode terminals and second electrode terminals. Tadokoro further discloses to apply a dielectric layer to insulate the respective patterns. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to leave an insulated pattern of the ITO layer between the first electrodes and the second electrode terminals in order to reduce the amount of material that is wasted in the manufacture of the device, and reducing the amount of dielectric material which is needed to accomplish the steepness reduction step of Tadokoro, resulting in a manufacture cost reduction of the device.

Regarding claims 19, 20 and 23, the claims are rejected over the reasons stated in the rejection of claims 7 and 8.

Claims 9, 15, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyaguchi et al. (US 6,297,589) in view of Tadokoro et al. (EP 1 022 931), and further in view of Okuyama et al. (US 6,531,815).

Regarding to claims 9 and 24, Miyaguchi-Tadokoro discloses the claimed invention except for the limitation of via holes formed at portions of the insulating layer covering the edge of the second electrode terminal.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Okuyama discloses an EL device (Figs. 38 and 6B) including an insulating layer (PLN2) comprising via holes so electrodes are connected to a terminal through said via holes, and teaches this embodiment to provide a connection having a substantially wide width, which lowers the resistance (Column 9, lines 35-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form via holes at portions of the insulating layer in order to provide a connection having a substantially wide width, which lowers the resistance. Further, it has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art to vary the shape of a component, i.e. forming via holes.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Miyaguchi-Tadokoro discloses the claimed invention except for the limitation of a second buffer layer provided over a top surface of the substrate.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Okuyama discloses an EL device comprising a buffer layer including SiO<sub>2</sub> disposed over a top surface of a substrate with the purpose of acting as a stopper against impurities eluted from the glass substrate (Column 12, lines 1-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a buffer layer over the substrate, in order to prevent impurities from the substrate to reach the EL element.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 28, 2006, in regards to the rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 10-17 and 19-25 over Miyaguchi et al. (US 6,297,589) in view of Tadokoro et al. (EP 1 022 931), or over Miyaguchi-Tadokoro in view of Okuyama et al. (US 6,531,815), have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contention that the applied prior art of reference (Miyaquchi '589, Tadokoro '931 or of Okuyama '815) fail to teach or suggest the "outer insulating layer between the emission area and the second electrode terminals ... to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminal and the substrate" as expressly defined in Applicants, since the insulating layer in the applied references is deposited to cover the whole surface of the transparent electrode layer except for locations where display electrodes and terminals are present, is not found persuasive. The reference to Miyaguchi discloses an intermediate insulating layer having a inter section located between and separating the plurality of parallel spaced apart electrode lines, and further discloses an outer section of the insulating layer located at an outside peripheral area where the electrode terminals would be located. Although Miyaguchi is silent in regards to the second electrode unit comprising second electrode terminals, and the outer insulating layer being formed to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminal facing the emission area, the teachings stated in the reference to Tadokoro provide for the missing limitations. Applicant's claimed invention does not exclude for the interand outer insulating layers to be manufactured from a single insulating layer, as long as an inter section provided under the electroluminescent layer and covering a space between each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes and an edge portion of a top surface of each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes is provided between the parallel electrodes, and an outer

section formed to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminal and the substrate is provided. Accordingly, it is the examiner's position that the claimed limitations are disclosed by the combination of Miyaguchi et al. (US 6,297,589) in view of Tadokoro et al. (EP 1 022 931).

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. However, applicant's amendment, filed September 8, 2005, necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariceli Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-2464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,846 Page 10

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mariceli Santiago Primary Examiner Art Unit 2879